

ETER

UNITED STATES SEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/480,544 01/10/00 KENTEN Ţ, 0039096-0030 **EXAMINER** HM12/1120 BARRY EVANS ESQ CHAKRABARTI, A WHITMAN BREED ABBOTT & MORGAN LLP ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 200 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10166 1655 **DATE MAILED:** 11/20/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/480,544**

Arun Chakrabarti

Applicant (s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

1655

Kenten et al.



Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 17, 2000 X This action is FINAL. ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____3 ___ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Disposition of Claims X Claim(s) 21-31 is/are pending in the application. Of the above, claim(s) ______ is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. X Claim(s) 21-31 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. ☐ Claims ______ are subject to restriction or election requirement. Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ______ is/are objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _______ is ☐approved ☐disapproved. ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *Certified copies not received: Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). Attachment(s) ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413 ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 □ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152 --- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Claims 1-20 have been canceled without prejudice towards further prosecution. New claims 21-31 have been added. Moreover, the specification has been amended to include a recitation of the applications in the family tree of the captioned application.

Double Patenting

2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

- 3. Claims 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 statutory type double patenting over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent 6,048,687 (April 11, 2000).
 - Claims 21-30 are exactly identical to that of claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent 6,048,687.
- 4. Claim 31 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,048,687 (April 11, 2000).

Art Unit:

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all steps for the detection of a specific nucleic acid sequence of claim 31 are essentially same as of claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,048,687. There is only a change of claim language in amplification step (b) of claim 31 which is obviously and necessarily same as step (b) of claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,048,687 where all the ingredients of amplification reactions are added together.

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

Application/Control Number: 09/480,544

Page 4

Art Unit:

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 306-5818.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission via the P.T.O. Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The CM1 Fax Center numbers for Technology Center 1600 are either (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242. Please note that the faxing of such papers must conform with the Notice to Comply published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).

Arun Chakrabarti

nu Kr. Chakpabash

Patent Examiner

Art Unit:

Art Unit 1655, November 16, 2000

W. Gary Jones Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1600